

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 00528 011920Z

70

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03 NSAE-00

NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20 USIA-15

SAM-01 NEA-11 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 IO-14 OIC-04 ACDA-19

AEC-11 OMB-01 DRC-01 /166 W
----- 038922

R 011740Z FEB 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC 2847

SECDEF WASHDC

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY LONDON

AMEMBASSY VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T USNATO 0528

E.O. 11652: GDS, 12/31/82

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: MISSION COMMENTARY ON SPC VERIFICATION PAPER

VIENNA FOR USDEL MBFR.

REF: A) USNATO 497

B) USNATO 472

SUMMARY: SPC DECIDED FEB. 1 THAT IT WOULD TAKE UP LATEST REVISION TO VERIFICATION PAPER AT MEETING NOW SCHEDULED FOR FEB 11. THERE FOLLOWS PROPOSED MISSION TACTICS AND PROPOSALS FOR MOVING FORWARD CURRENT DRAFT. COMMENTS ARE KEYED TO BRACKETED ALTERNATIVE LANGUAGE INTRODUCED AT JAN 28 SPC MEETING (TEXT REF A), TOGETHER WITH ALLIED POSITIONS REFLECTED IN MISSION'S REPORTING CABLE (REF B). ACTION REQUESTED: GUIDANCE ON NEW REVISIONS IN TIME FOR FEB 11 MEETING. END SUMMARY.

1. NATIONAL TECHNICAL MEANS (PARA 5). IN LIGHT OF EMPHATIC UK
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 00528 011920Z

SUPPORT FOR ALTERNATIVE US LANGUAGE FOR SECOND SENTENCE, WE ARE HOPEFUL

THIS ISSUE CAN BE PUT ASIDE. IF FRG CAN ACCEPT THRUST OF OUR NEW LANGUAGE, BUT RESISTS TERM "BE INTERESTED IN"--AND IF THIS IS ONLY

POINT PREVENTING REMOVAL OF BRACKETS-- WE SUGGEST US AGREE TO
ALTERNATIVE ALONG LINES THAT "ALLIES CAN WISH TO SHARE INFORMATION...
.."

2. VERIFICATION OF STABILIZING MEASURES, PARA 19 AND BY EXTENSION
PARA 9). WE THINK CENTRAL REGION ALLIES WILL FINALLY FALL OFF THIS
QUESTION IF WE CONTINUE TO HAMMER HOME ARGUMENT THAT AN IN-PLACE
VERIFICATION SYSTEM WILL PROBABLY DETECT SIGNIFICANT VIOLATIONS
OF AN AGREEMENT ON STABILIZING MEASURES WITHOUT ALLIES HAVING
TO NEGOTIATE A SEPARATE SYSTEM. WE PROPOSE HOLDING FIRM
ON OUR LATEST STATEMENT OPPOSING A SEPARATE VERIFICATION SYSTEM
APPLIED TO STABILIZING MEASURES. WOULD APPRECIATE ANY FURTHER POINTS
TO SUPPORT US POSITION.

3. MEASURES OUTSIDE THE NGA (PARA 9). TURKEY--SUPPORTED
BY GREECE--WILL PROBABLY WORK HARD TO RETAIN PARA 9. WE INTEND
TO STAND PAT. AS NECESSARY, WE WILL PURSUE
RECIPROCITY IN PHASE I TO CONFRONT EUROPEANS WITH UNACCEPTABLE
DEMANDS FOR MEASURES IN PHASE II.

4. LIAISON OFFICERS (PARA 10). GIVEN FIRM FRG VIEWS NOW STRONGLY
ENDORSED BY UK (PARA 3, REF B) AND GENERALLY SUPPORTED BY OTHER ALLIES,

WE BELIEVE IT WILL BE INCREASINGLY DIFFICULT TO GARNER SUPPORT FOR
EXCLUDING LIAISON OFFICERS. UK--OBVIOUSLY SPEAKING FOR OTHERS
IN THE NGA--HAS SAID THAT ALLIES SHOULD NOT ALLOW SOVIETS TO
ROAM FREELY AROUND A GOOD DEAL OF WESTERN EUROPE. MANY ALLIES TEND
TO SEE THIS AS CRITICAL MATTER WHICH AFFECTS--AND MIGHT COMPROMISE--
THEIR NATIONAL SOVEREIGNTY. FRG AND UK ARE LIKELY TO STAND FIRM ON
THIS ISSUE, EVEN TO THE EXTENT OF FOREGOING ANY BENEFITS TO NATO
WHICH INCLUSIONS OF LIAISON OFFICERS MIGHT HAVE ON PAC SIDE OF
NGA. TO GET AROUND PROBLEM WE MIGHT PROPOSE TO ALLIES THAT THEY NOT
PUT FORWARD LIAISON OFFICER CONCEPT IN CONJUNCTION WITH A VERIFICATION
PACKAGE, ON THE UNDERSTANDING THAT IF SOVIETS ASKED FOR THEM (WHICH THEY

PROBABLY WOULD), ALLIES WOULD AGREE TO ACCEPT THEM.
PUTTING SOVIETS IN THE ROLE OF DEMANDER WOULD,
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 00528 011920Z

ENABLE ALLIES TO IMPOSE SPECIFIC AND POSSIBLY ADVANTAGEOUS CONDITIONS

ON THE SCOPE OF THEIR ACTIVITIES. WOULD WASHINGTON FAVOR
FOREGOING COMPROMISE PROPOSAL?

5. MOBILE TEAMS/STATIC POSTS ISSUE (PARAS 22, 25, 27 & 30).

WE WILL NEED FURTHER GUIDANCE ON HOW US WISHES TO HANDLE THIS QUESTION,

GIVEN INCLUSION OF EXTENSIVE UK LANGUAGE FAVORING A COMBINATION OF
BOTH SYSTEMS. SEEN FROM HERE, THERE ARE TWO DISTINCT ISSUES INVOLVED;
THE STRICTLY MILITARY ADVANTAGE, AND THE NEGOTIATING TACTIC ALLIES
SHOULD ADOPT. WE THINK US SHOULD ADDRESS BOTH ISSUES. FROM MILITARY

VIEW POINT, ARE THERE GREATER ADVANTAGES TO A MOBILE SYSTEM OVER A COMBINED SYSTEM WHICH WE COULD PUT FORWARD TO COUNTER THE UK'S MILITARY ARGUMENT? DO THESE ADVANTAGES HOLD FOR VERIFYING REDUCTIONS (MEASURE A), AND POST-REDUCTION MOVEMENTS (MEASURE B)? IF SO, WOULD APPRECIATE SPECIFIC POINTS TO USE AGAINST UK ASSERTIONS. IF WE CANNOT DISPUTE BRITISH CONTENTION ON MILITARY GROUNDS, WE WILL THEN HAVE TO BASE OUR PREFERENCE FOR MOBILE TEAMS ON TACTICAL AND OR POLITICAL ARGUMENTS. CAN WASHINGTON FURNISH SUCH ARGUMENTS? IF SO, WE MIGHT PROPOSE INCLUSION OF LANGUAGE ACKNOWLEDGING THEORETICAL SUPERIORITY OF MOBILE TEAM/STATIC POST COMBINATION (THUS BOWING TO BRITISH ARGUMENT), BUT CONCLUDE THAT FOR OTHER REASONS, ACHIEVEMENT OF AN ACCEPTABLE VERIFICATION PACKAGE IS LIKELY TO BE GREATER IF WE GO FOR MOBILE TEAMS ALONE.

6. OTHER UNBRACKETED UK CHANGES (SEE LANGUAGE SO IDENTIFIED IN REF A). ARE THESE ACCEPTABLE?
RUMSFELD

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 01 FEB 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO00528
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS, 12/31/82
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19740267/abbryszb.tel
Line Count: 127
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A) USNATO 497 B) USNATO 472
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 19 JUL 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <19-Jul-2001 by willialc>; APPROVED <30 APR 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: MISSION COMMENTARY ON SPC VERIFICATION PAPER
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
LONDON
VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005

